BUREAU OF WATER PROTECTION AND LAND REUSE
FEB 3 3 2010

17 Gifford Road West Hartford, CT 06119

February 1, 2010

Paul Stacey Bureau of Water Protection DEP 79 Elm Street Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Mr. Stacey:

I attended the January 21 hearing on the new water regulation. I support these new regulations. Opponents raised several arguments.

1) We can't afford it.

Why not? Is running out of clean water cheaper? The time to save the rivers is when we still have them.

2) Drill new wells.

Many people think we have three planets - the surface where we live; a magic underground planet that contains infinite resources; and a third on called *someplace else*, where we can dump our trash.

3) We don't use any water.

Farms, golf courses, and industry put back everything they take out. Except it's full pesticides, fertilizer, and chemicals. New water regulations will benefit these users. How valuable will a farm or a golf course be in a future with NO water?

One are of the new regulations does concern me. It allows for a Class 4 river, which will have NO restrictions on quality. Why is this a bad idea?

Water flows downhill. Pollute a small stream and it pollutes a big stream. The big stream pollutes a small river. Small rivers empty into large rivers, which empty into Long Island Sound. Some say, "Dilution is the solution." Unfortunately, fish live in this environment and reconcentrate these toxins in the bodies.

I do not eat farmed salmon. If you permit a Class 4 (aka open sewer) stream, more people will either join me avoiding fish or get sick from eating them. Please eliminate Class 4. We really should have only one class - natural, but I can live with 3. Not sure we can live with a Class 4.

Sincerely,

Charles Gagliardi



Mr Paul Stacey

Bureau of Water

Protection

79 Elm Street Hartford CT 06/06

Selection of the select

ロー語のとうちゃろして

PORT AND CORRECTION OF THE